

Appl. No. 10/763,118  
Amdt. Dated May 11, 2005  
Reply to Notice of April 11, 2005

#### REMARKS

##### Status of the Claims

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1-15 currently stand rejected.

##### I. Broadening Claim Amendments and New Claims

Applicants broadened claims 1, 7, 12 and 15 to more particularly point out what the Applicants consider to be their invention. No new matter is added with the amendments to the claims, which are fully supported by the specification.

Applicants have added new claims 16-20. No new matter has been added with the addition of claims 16-20, which are supported by the original claims and the specification.

##### II. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Amendment of claim 6 renders the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the rejection in light of amendment of claim 6.

Appl. No. 10/763,118  
Amdt. Dated May 11, 2005  
Reply to Notice of April 11, 2005

III. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuntimaddi et al (US 2005/0009636) in view of Watanabe (US 2001/0031673). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited combination is not allowed. The Kuntimaddi et al patent application was filed on July 28, 2004, more than six months after the instant application. Therefore it does not qualify as prior art under any interpretation of law and must be removed as a prior art reference.

The teaching of the Watanabe publication must be viewed alone because it is improper to combine with Kuntimaddi, which is not prior art. The Watanabe publication does not teach the Applicants cover material as described in claims 1-15.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the obviousness rejection in light of the improper art combination and failure to teach the claimed invention.

Appl. No. 10/763,118  
Amdt. Dated May 11, 2005  
Reply to Notice of April 11, 2005

#### IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of all rejections of the claims in light of the removal of the improper prior art. If any issues remain, Applicants request that the undersigned counsel be contact via collect call to resolve the issue.

Please feel free to call collect with any questions regarding this submission or any matters relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey D. Washville  
Reg. No. 46,366

Date: May 11, 2005

15 Rye Street, Suite 312  
Portsmouth, NH 03801  
Tel.: (603) 427-0070  
FAX: (603) 427-5530

#### Certificate of Facsimile Transmission under 1.8

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper along with any paper or document referred to therein as being attached or enclosed, is being faxed to (703)-872-9306 in lieu of deposit with the United States Postal Service to the Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450- This 11<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2005.

Jeffrey D. Washville